UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,589	03/30/2001	James T. Dollins	GP-300750	5685
ANTHONY LU	7590 04/06/2007 IKE SIMON	EXAMINER		
GENERAL MOTORS CORP - LEGAL STAFF MAL CODE 482-C23-B21 P O BOX 300 DETROIT, MI 48265-3000			UTAMA, ROBERT J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	A DEDIOD OF BESDONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVED.	Y MODE
SHOKTENED STATUTORY	I FERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 04		04/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

				SP				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/820,589	DOLLINS ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Robert J. Utama	3714					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports.	pears on the cover she	et with the correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any earn	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Densions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMM 36(a). In no event, however, n will apply and will expire SIX (6), cause the application to become	UNICATION.  nay a reply be timely filed  ) MONTHS from the mailing date of this one ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·				
Status			· ·					
1)⊠								
2a)[]								
3)	-							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	±x paπe Quayle, 1935	O.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requiremen	t.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)	0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the atta	ached Office Action or form P	11O-152.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received	<b>1</b> .					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received	I in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have	been received in this Nationa	I Stage				
	application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a))						
* (	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies	s not received.					
Attachme	nt(s)	_						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	, —	view Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date					
· ==	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	<u> </u>	ce of Informal Patent Application					
· —	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🗌 Othe	er:					

Art Unit: 3714

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is a response to the amendment filed on: 12/19/2005. The current status of claim is as follow: claims 1-3 are still pending. No claim has been cancelled or withdrawn from consideration.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 3. Claim 1-3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by O'connor et al US 6,535,861.

Claim 1: O'Connor '861 provide a teaching of an interactive training system that provides scenario that defined a list of role or task is defined and explained to the trainee (col. 40:60 – 41:5). O'Connor '861 also provide a teaching where a scenario is used to illustrate a progression of information (i.e: a series of event) where the student can apply the role and task that has been taught (col. 41:10-25). O'Connor 861 provide a teaching for a guidance program where a selected portion of the application is shown to the user and steps of the business process is identified and explained to the trainee (col. 41:40-50, col. 42:55-62 and FIG. 2 item 234). This scenario instruction is presented to the student in a variety of graphical or textual mean (see FIG. 15 and col 2:55-60).

Art Unit: 3714

Claim 2: O'Connor '861 provide a teaching of an interactive training system that provides scenario that defined a list of role or task is defined and explained to the trainee (see O'Connor 861 col. 40:60 – 41:5). O'Connor '861 also provide a teaching where a scenario is used to illustrate a progression of information (i.e. a series of event) where the student can apply the role and task that has been taught (col. 41:10-25). O'Connor 861 provide a teaching for a guidance program where a selected portion of the application is shown to the user and steps of the business process is identified and explained to the trainee (col. 41:40-50, col. 42:55-62 and FIG. 2 item 234). O'Connor '861 scenario also includes a task stage, where the student is taught and tested on materials he/she needed to fufill the task (col.41:40-47), and action stage which includes a supplementary function which provide teaching for function supporting the main process function and outside the of the main process function (col. 41:50-59 see war stories or other links). This scenario instruction is presented to the student in a variety of graphical or textual mean (see FIG. 15 and col 2:55-60). **Claim 3:** O'Connor '861 provide a teaching of an interactive training system that provides scenario that defined a list of role or task is defined and explained to the trainee (see O'Connor 861 col. 40:60 - 41:5). O'Connor '861 also provide a teaching where a scenario is used to illustrate a progression of information (i.e: a series of event) where the student can apply the role and task that has been taught (col. 41:10-25). O'Connor 861 provide a teaching for a guidance program where a selected portion of the application is shown to the user and steps of the business process is identified and explained to the trainee (col. 41:40-50, col. 42:55-62 and FIG. 2 item 234). O'Connor '861 scenario also provide the option of selection process function categories and its related supplementary function (col. 41:45-50) and these process function can

Art Unit: 3714

also include more manipulation of the application system (col. 41:48-50 Domain module manipulation). This scenario instruction is presented to the student in a variety of graphical or textual mean (see FIG. 15 and col 2:55-60).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over McMenimen et al US 6,514,079 and in view of Judd et al US 5,602,982.

  Claim 1: McMenimen '079 provide a teaching of an interactive training system that provides scenario that defined a list of role or task is defined and explained to the trainee (see McMenimen col. 5:35-41 and FIG.3). McMenimen '079 also provide a teaching where a scenario is used to illustrate a progression of information (i.e: a series of event) where the student can apply the role and task that has been taught. The scenario instruction is demonstrated using a variety of graphical, audio and textual mean (McMenimen col. 4:36-40). McMenimen is silent whether the series of roles and task of the business process is supported with guidance where a selected portion of application is accessed and steps of the business process are identified and defined.

Judd '982 provide a teaching where during the training session that is equipped with a guidance program where a selected portion of the application is shown to the

Art Unit: 3714

user and steps of the business process is identified and explained to the trainee (see Judd '982 col. 4:30-52 and FIG. 2-4H). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the system McMeninem '079 with the teaching of showing a selected portion of the application and providing a step by step instruction to the user as taught by Judd '982. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to make this combination since it would allow the system to enable the trainee to learn with an application that simulates the capability and function of the application he/she will see in the field (see Judd '982 Col.2:30-50).

Claim 3: McMenimen '079 provide a teaching of an interactive training system that provides scenario that defined a list of role or task is defined and explained to the trainee (see McMenimen col. 5:35-41 and FIG.3). McMenimen '079 also provide a teaching where a scenario is used to illustrate a progression of information (i.e: a series of event) where the student can apply the role and task that has been taught. The scenario instruction is demonstrated using a variety of graphical, audio and textual mean (McMenimen col. 4:36-40). McMenimen is silent whether the series of roles and task of the business process is supported with guidance where a selected portion of application is accessed and steps of the business process are identified and defined. McMenimen also lacks teaching on where the user has the option to select a number of process function categories.

Judd '982 provide a teaching where during the training session that is equipped with a guidance program where a selected portion of the application is shown to the user and steps of the business process is identified and explained to the trainee (see Judd '982 col. 4:30-52). Judd '982 also provide a teaching where the user have the option to select a number of process function categories (see Judd '982 FIG. 1 and col. 4:21-

Art Unit: 3714

30) where each categories contain a series of role and task to be identified and explained to the trainee (Judd '982 col. 4:30-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the system McMeninem '079 with the teaching of showing a selected portion of the application and providing a step by step instruction to the user as taught by Judd '982. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to make this combination since it would allow the system to enable the trainee to learn with an application that simulates the capability and function of the application he/she will see in the field (see Judd '982 Col.2:30-50).

6. Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMenimen et al US 6,514,079, in view of Judd et al US 5,602,982 and further in view of Rice 5,788,504

Claim 2: McMenimen '079 provide a teaching of an interactive training system that provides scenario that defined a list of role or task is defined and explained to the trainee (see McMenimen col.5:35-41 and FIG.3). McMenimen '079 also provide a teaching where a scenario is used to illustrate a progression of information (i.e: a series of event) where the student can apply the role and task that has been taught. The scenario instruction is demonstrated using a variety of graphical, audio and textual mean (McMenimen col. 4:36-40). McMenimen is silent whether the series of roles and task of the business process is supported with guidance where a selected portion of application is accessed and steps of the business process are identified and defined.

Judd '982 provide a teaching where during the training session that is equipped with a guidance program where a selected portion of the application is shown to the

Art Unit: 3714

user and steps of the business process is identified and explained to the trainee (see Judd '982 col. 4:30-52 and FIG. 2-4H). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the system McMeninem '079 with the teaching of showing a selected portion of the application and providing a step by step instruction to the user as taught by Judd '982. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to make this combination since it would allow the system to enable the trainee to learn with an application that simulates the capability and function of the application he/she will see in the field (see Judd '982 Col.2:30-50).

Both reference McMenimen and Judd lacks the feature of a cross functional links to a supplementary function where the supplementary function support the primary process function and is outside the process function task. However, Rice '504 teaches of a training system where the scenario also includes link to a supplementary function (i.e. Miscellaneous duties) and the miscellaneous duties is outside the process function task (see Rice '504 FIG. 6 item 201). Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify the teaching of McMenimen and Judd with the teaching of Rice '504. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to make this combination since it would allow the system to enable the trainee to be train of all aspect of his/her responsibilities.

#### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-3 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Ujita 5.306,154
- Otsby 5,326,270

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Utama whose telephone number is (571) 272-1676. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert PEZZUTO can be reached on (571)272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

